



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the Sidney Lanier High School at Montgomery, Alabama, there was begun, in November, 1919, a periodical entitled *Forum Romanum*. Four numbers of this periodical have come into my hands, for November, 1919, January, February, and March, 1920. Each number contains four pages; every part of the number, except the advertisements, is in Latin. The periodical is under the management of members of the Senior class of the School. The contents include little essays about the School life, notes and suggestions of various sorts, attempts to put into Latin matters of public interest (such as the announcement that General Pershing was to visit Montgomery), reference to Red Cross drives, etc. The contributors deserve much praise for their energy, but their Latin leaves a tremendous lot to be desired. Mistakes in the Latin, however, by their very number and magnitude, show clearly that the students are conducting the paper themselves, and that it is not in any sense their teachers' product.

Miss Louise Berrey, head of the Department of Latin at this School, wrote me, in March, 1920, as follows:

The purpose of the *Forum Romanum* has been not only to stimulate an interest in Latin, but also to get people with what might be called an aversion for Latin prose to feel and appreciate the simple case relations, for example, dative and accusative. . . . We know there are many mistakes, both in choice of words and in constructions, but somehow we feel that the purpose of the paper has been achieved. There is much more interest in prose than ever before. Let me say, too, that every article is the effort of some high school child. . . . The two stories, *Duo Amici* and *Regina Bona Russiae*, were written by two first year students after four months of study of the language.

In November, 1919, the Classical Club of the Boys' High School, Brooklyn, began the publication of an eight-page leaflet called *Forum Latinum*. Volume 2, No. 4 was published in February, 1921. In this I find the interesting statement that the *Forum Latinum* had reached a circulation of 1,800 copies. This issue contains also a statement, by the way, to the effect that for the term beginning in February, 1921, there was, in the Boys' High School, an increase of about 15% in the number of students beginning Latin. In the fifth term, Latin is elective in this School; yet there was last year an increase of over 20% in the number of students in that term. The Vergil classes showed an increase of about 10%.

The paper is under the editorial direction of the students themselves. They have the assistance, however, of one or more Faculty advisers. The contents of each number are partly in English, partly in Latin. The Latin contents of the first number contained a *Colloquium Auditum in Sala Prandii*; an up-to-date version of Cicero, *Cat. I. 1* (a student is asked to explain why he continues to use a 'horse'); odds and ends of humor; a Latin version of America; a statement that Dr. Riess, who is Head of the Department

of Classics at the Boys' High School, would like to meet students interested in antiquities, for the purpose of forming groups to visit the Metropolitan Museum of Art, to study ancient life directly from the original monuments and casts; a list of Latin verbs, with their meanings, part of the vocabulary of second term Latin.

Later numbers show the same combination of English and Latin. An interesting feature in those numbers is the presence of illustrations. Some of these are reproductions of ancient things; others are cartoons (parodies of ancient matter). To the former class belongs the reproduction of the graffito which represents an ass or a donkey and a mill, beneath which are the Latin words, *Labora, aselle, quomodo ego laboravi, et proderit tibi*. An excellent feature is the publication from time to time of paragraphs from classical authors. One such paragraph is entitled *Caesar, a Pen Portrait* (Suetonius's account of Caesar's physical appearance and of certain of his habits and characteristics). Again, in Volume 1, No. 3, the account of the Werwolf in Petronius, *Cena Trimalchionis* 61-62, is reprinted, with notes that help to understanding of the text.

Volume 2, No. 4, dated February, 1921, contains on its front cover a cut of the ruins of the Coliseum. On page 6, there are given, from ancient sources, representations of a Roman barber at work, a Roman razor, and a Roman headdress. There is a page which seems to me a waste of good ink and paper, containing alleged cartoons and alleged Latin under the caption *Ku Klux Klan*. There are Latin jokes, Latin riddles, Roman colloquial expressions, an *Oratio Magna Marci Antoni*, and allied matters.

(To be concluded)

C. K.

VIRGILIAN DETERMINISM

In an interestingly written article entitled *Epicurean Determinism in the Aeneid*¹ Professor Tenney Frank has attempted to show that the early Epicurean studies and associations of Vergil's youth were not followed, as most modern scholars have held, by a conversion to Stoicism, but continued unchanged, appearing in definite outcroppings all through the *Aeneid*. So plausible appears the argumentation, but yet, in my opinion, so mistaken are its premises and its results that it seems worth while to reexamine the points raised by the article in its divergence from the accepted view².

After a résumé of Vergil's early philosophical training and beliefs the thesis is advanced (116) that the eschatology of *Aeneid* 6 (which, according to Profes-

¹American Journal of Philology 41 (1920), 115-126.

²I shall follow, as nearly as practicable, the order of the article under discussion.

sor Frank, has furnished the chief reason for supposing that Vergil in his maturity rejected Epicureanism for Stoicism)

was adopted as a *mythos* for purposes of plot, and that the poet continued, while writing the Aeneid, in the faith which he had avowed with enthusiasm in the Eclogues and Georgics.

But where is this enthusiastic confession of faith found? On page 115 we are referred to Ecl. 6.31-32 namque canebar uti magnum per inane coacta semina terrarumque animaeque marisque fuissent, etc., a passage of very evident atomistic character. But before using this passage as evidence for the views of Vergil himself one must settle the very vexed question of the meaning of the whole poem. Servius (whom elsewhere Professor Frank delights to honor) remarks on verse 72: hoc Euphorionis continent carmina quae Gallus transtulit in sermonem Latinum. From this comment Skutsch wished to find in the various songs of Silenus a summary of the works of Gallus, while Cartault suggested that Vergil was here giving a résumé of his readings and studies³. These views (and others) may be wrong, but, until the true explanation of the poem is established, this passage cannot safely be adduced to show Vergil's own belief. Other Epicurean traces in the Eclogues I have not been able to find⁴. On the contrary, there is distinct disapproval felt⁵ for the rival lover who supposes the gods indifferent to human actions. And if two references to deification (5.56 ff.; 8.46 ff.) be dismissed as mere poetic imagery (together with the list of omens in Georg. 1.463 ff.), what shall we do with the philosophy of the Fourth Eclogue (about which Professor Frank is discreetly silent), with its doctrine of secular repetition and the Golden Age, of sin, and of Fate (46 f.)?

Or let us turn to the Georgics. The only Epicurean passage here cited (page 118) is 2.490 ff.: felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas, etc. This is undoubtedly, as all editors have recognized from its thought and Lucretian phraseology, a tribute either to Lucretius (whose works Vergil certainly knew, admired, and imitated) or to some other Epicurean, perhaps, as Professor Frank seems to hold, to Epicurus himself. But we must not forget how Vergil after these lines of laudation continues (2.493 ff.): fortunatus et ille deos qui novit agrestis Panaque Silvanumque senem nymphasque sorores. The life of this religiously-minded⁶ countryman, here set in as sharp antithesis to that of the sceptical scientist as that even today at times expressed between 'faith' and 'science' (to the disparagement of the latter), approaches most closely, as Vergil is careful to tell us (2.532 ff.), to that

of the Golden Age⁷, and is distinguished by just those characteristics which have made Rome great. Even Professor Frank admits (125) that Georg. 1.231-251 has a Stoic coloring, but he says that the passage is not inconsistent with Vergil's Epicurean views⁸. The passage in 4.218 ff. (his quidam signis atque haec exempla secuti esse apibus partem divinae mentis et haustus aetherios dixere, deum namque ire per omnia, etc.) certainly suggests Aen. 6.724 ff. (with the words spiritus intus alit), and, though ascribed to *quidam* rather than vouched for by the poet, is apparently not felt to merit refutation⁹. The story of Orpheus and Eurydice (4.467 ff.), even if it prove nothing in regard to Vergil's own beliefs about the next world, at least contains no hint of Epicureanism. And if any reference to the gods and their influence upon human affairs found anywhere in classical Latin poetry bears the mark of sincerity, it is the address to the *di patrii indigetes* in 1.498 ff. I have dwelt upon these passages in the Eclogues and the Georgics, not because Professor Frank deals particularly with those works, but because I feel that his assumption in regard to them is wrong and also because from them we get a fairer idea of what to expect when we approach the Aeneid.

The appeal of Epicureanism was, we are told (116 f.), that, while it kept its feet upon the ground, it brought "a gospel of illumination to a race eager for light, opening vistas into an infinity of worlds", etc. But, if this be advanced as a reason for its appeal to the poetic nature of Vergil, it must appear remarkable that he made so little use of his opportunity to set forth its teachings. The instances which Professor Frank cites (118) are two passages already discussed (Ecl. 6.31 ff.; Georg. 2.490 ff.) and the song of Iopas at the banquet of Dido (Aen. 1.740). Iopas sings, to be sure, a song of creation, but it contains absolutely no cosmic doctrine, either Epicurean or Stoic.

The Epicurean "phrases and notions" which are cited (118) from the Aeneid seem more convincing in the adapted phraseology here given them than in their original context and wording. Thus, according to Professor Frank, "the atoms of fire are struck out of the flint" in Aen. 6.6; yet the Latin gives no trace of 'atoms', but reads *semina flammae*, which seems a pretty close imitation of Od. 5.490 *σπέρμα πυρός*. Truly we must beware lest we make Homer an Epicurean¹⁰! Again, says Professor Frank, "atoms of light are emitted from the sun", but the atomism becomes more evanescent than an Epicurean *εἰδωλον* if we turn to the Latin of the passages adduced (Aen. 7.526 f. *aeraque fulgent sole lacessita et lucem sub nubila iactant*; 8.22 ff. *ubi lumen aenis sole repercusso aut radiantis imagine lunae omnia pervolat*,

³For these and other views see Schanz, *Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur*, 2, 1^a, 45 f. (1911).

⁴Unless 9.5, quoniam Fors omnia versat, be stressed. But these words express a natural and doubtless temporary emotion of the evicted Moeris, and surely not the feeling of the poet himself.

⁵8.35. ⁶2.527 ff. Compare also 2.473 f., and, for the attitude toward holy days, 1.268 ff. Sacrifices are prescribed (e. g. 1.338) and the paying of vows is assumed (1.437).

⁷For other traces of cyclic theory compare 1.121 ff.

⁸Yet what are we to say of 1.238, munere concessae divom? And Jupiter is elsewhere (1.353 ff.; 4.149) made the cause of phenomena in a manner unlike that of Epicureanism.

⁹In Georgics 1.415 Vergil takes a different view of the spirit within lower animals, but did not even the Stoics the same? Compare Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1.118.

¹⁰For this danger compare Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 1.41.

etc.). In 8.320¹¹, Professor Frank maintains, "early men were born duro robore and lived like those described in the fifth book of Lucretius" (presumably Lucr. 5.1281 ff.), but, although there is likeness between Vergil and Lucretius, the former contains at this point nothing to which the most rigid Stoic need have objected. "... there are still compliments for Memmius (V, 117)", but lines 117 ff. merely designate Mnesteus, Sergestus, and Cloanthus as the ancestors of the Memmii, the Sergii, and the Cluentii, and the motive for this allusion is quite in keeping with similar aetiological details elsewhere in the poem and need carry no trace of Epicurean allusion¹². Professor Frank quotes the statement of Conington that there are nearly two hundred reminiscences of Lucretius in the Aeneid, and that the reminiscences increase in frequency in the later books. But studies subsequent to those of Conington encourage us to look to Ennius as the real source of many passages where identity is found between Lucretius and Vergil¹³, and where borrowings from Lucretius do undeniably occur they are, in the main, those of phraseology rather than of content.

More important is the test of Vergil's philosophy which depends upon his interpretation of fate¹⁴. Professor Frank writes (119):

Determinism was accepted by both schools but with a difference. To the Stoic, *fatum* is a synonym of providence whose popular name is Zeus. The Epicurean also accepts *fatum* as governing the universe, but it is not teleological, and Zeus is not identified with it but is, like man, subordinated to it. ... If then Virgil were a Stoic, his Jupiter should be omnipotent and omniscient and the embodiment of *fatum*, and his human characters must be represented as devoid of independent power: but such ideas are not found in the Aeneid.

With this definition of what Stoics should have believed let us contrast an ancient statement of what they did believe: Comm. in Luc. 2.306 (=Stoicorum

Veterum Fragmenta 2, No. 924): et hoc secundum Stoicos qui omnia dicunt fato regi et semel constituta nec a numinibus posse mutari¹⁵. If the ancient passage be correct, it is unnecessary even to discuss the instances from the Aeneid cited by Professor Frank, on pages 119 f., to illustrate the supremacy of fate over the gods, for this is exactly what we ought to find: hence why should we be surprised when we find it? The difficulty really lies, not with Vergil or even with Stoicism, but with the inherent difficulties in the age-long problem of impersonal determinism, divine will, and human freedom, a puzzle too serious for philosophers far more subtle than was Vergil¹⁶. Again, some stress is laid (120) upon passages implying the power of the individual to thwart fate (1.299 ff.; 5.700 ff.), but Professor Frank allows even to the Stoics a slight degree of freedom of action (119), and it will be noticed that, in all the passages which he here cites¹⁷, though Vergil may perhaps assert the power of individual choice, yet the action which ensues is strictly in accord with fate, and Jupiter cooperates in executing the decisions of fate. I cannot feel, then, that "The Stoic hypothesis seems to break down completely in such passages".

Still less when I read the Aeneid as a whole, with the evident and inevitable march of its events, can I dismiss all teleological notions. The opening lines alone, which, if any, should express the purpose and the character of the work, indicate this in unforgettable phrases—fato profugus; vi superum; dumcon deret urbem; tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem. If there is no teleology here, where, pray, are we to look for it?

But Professor Frank tells us (121) that, the moment that Aeneas was selected as the hero of the poem, it became necessary to take, along with him, the machinery of the Olympian gods; Vergil was too conscientious in his attempts to restore the atmosphere of the heroic age to dispense with these otherwise unwelcome encumbrances. Book 6, furthermore, was inserted "because the poet needed for his own purposes esa vision of incorporated souls of Roman heroes" (123). True, but why did Vergil need this vision, if not to enhance the reader's realization of the divinely ordained and guided continuity and purpose of the Roman race? To say that Book 6 is syncretistic and not purely Stoic in its philosophy is perhaps also true; it doubtless does not exhibit the Stoicism of Zeno nor yet that of Chrysippus; but Stoicism had had many forms,

¹¹So cited; better, 314 ff.

¹²Three cases cited in 118, n. 6 prove little or nothing; two of them are quoted incompletely, the second being so curtailed as to distort the sense.

¹³See especially Wreschnick, De Cicerone Lucretioque Ennii Imitatoribus (1907); Norden, Aeneis, Buch VI², 371 (1916).

¹⁴The word *fatum* occurs in Lucretius five times, *fatalis* once (according to Paulson, Index Lucretianus [1911]), in a total of 7,415 lines; in Vergil's Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid (12,913 lines) *fatum* is found 134 times, *fatalis* 12 (according to Wetmore's Index Verborum Vergilianus [1911]). This gives a total for the two words in Vergil of 146 as contrasted with the six cases in Lucretius. If the occurrences in Lucretius were proportional in frequency to those in Vergil we ought, in 7,415 lines, to expect 84 references instead of six. It should be further noted that Lucretius is a philosophical poet arguing against fate, while Vergil is merely an epic poet, who would, in ordinary circumstances, be less likely to deal in such conceptions unless particularly interested in them by reason of his own beliefs or experience. So great frequency in Vergil ought of itself, then, to arouse the suspicion that Vergil had more than an Epicurean interest in fate. Professor Frank holds, however, that many occurrences of the word in Vergil have no philosophical meaning (120, n. 10). This is doubtless true: yet who will determine in a particular case? In 4.696 quia nec fato merita nec morte peribat, he would interpret the passage philosophically of Dido's thwarting the fates by her suicide, while Henry and Conington—non sordidi auctores naturae verique—take *fato* in a "practical rather than a philosophical sense", of a "natural death", as opposed to an untimely death. Truly the private interpretation of scripture has its dangers! If a philosophical interpretation, however, be sought at this point, the Scholia Danielis will furnish one sufficiently subtle.

¹⁵Compare also Servius on Aeneid 1.357 (=Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta 2, No. 923): et simul per transitum Stoicorum dogma ostendit, nulla ratione posse fata mutari; Arnold, Roman Stoicism, 199 ff. (1911).

¹⁶The discussion of the use of *omnipotens* (119) is inconclusive. Professor Wetmore, Index Verborum Vergilianus, cites eighteen instances where it refers to Jupiter (to which we should perhaps add two where it refers to Olympus) and two referring to Juno. I find some clearly referring to Apollo. In any case, as Professor Frank himself admits, the meaning of the term may be more or less relative, and no sound argument, I think, can be based upon it.

¹⁷Except 4.696, which I have discussed above, in note 14.

and a follower of Posidonius would, I believe, in Vergil's day have qualified pretty well for membership in the Stoic household of faith.

—But, Book 6 is, for Professor Frank, a mere *mythos* like Plato's *mythos* of Er. The Epicureans, he says, allowed their poets much freedom in the use of heterodox material (125), as we may learn from Lucretius (2.655). But the purely figurative use there sanctioned and the largely decorative lines of Lucr. 5.737 are far removed from the serious character of Aeneid 6. Nor is it quite correct to speak (126) of the "blunt statement of Servius (on VI, 893) that the portal of unreal dreams refers the imagery of the sixth book to fiction", for Servius's note gives several confused and inconsistent suggestions. I believe, with Norden¹⁸, that the correct explanation of the ivory gate is that given by the late William Everett¹⁹, and that its significance is primarily temporal, indicating that Aeneas left the underworld before midnight²⁰. Though there is doubtless much, then, in Book 6 which is not to be taken as the exact and dogmatic belief of Vergil (as the eschatology of Plato's *Phaedo* was not considered by its author as precise and definite), yet we are unjustified in explaining the whole book away as a mere fiction of the literary imagination.

Professor Frank says little or nothing of the character of Aeneas. It is a large subject and need not here be discussed save to say that perhaps nowhere in Roman imaginative literature have we a better incarnation of the Stoic ideal, in which both the virtues and the defects of that conception are fully illustrated. This is to be seen at every turn, but particularly in Book 4. The mere mention of a few phrases is enough: ille Iovis monitis immota tenebat lumina et obnixus curam sub corde premebat (331-332); me si fata meis paterentur ducere vitam auspiciis et sponte mea componere curas, etc. (340-341); Italiam non sponte sequor (361); tunditur et magno persentit pectore curas; mens immota manet, lacrimae volvuntur inanes (448-449)²¹. It would be tempting to contrast Dido with Aeneas and to find in her the embodiment of Epicurean ideals, but I do not desire at this time to press this point.

Vergil deliberately selected, then, in the composition of the Aeneid, a theme inseparably entangled with the idea of a purposeful, divinely appointed destiny, and depicted his hero as a typical Stoic might well have been shown. That one who was an Epicurean at heart might have selected such a theme and so treated it is, of course, a physical possibility, just as it is possible that a Unitarian might choose as the subject of a great poem the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, but the opposite probabilities are so overwhelming that an uncommon burden of proof rests

upon him who would reverse the accepted interpretation.

Other Romans had been Epicureans and had later rejected the faith—witness the case of Cicero²²—, and if we read the philosophical works of Cicero we may get some idea of why they did so. What Vergil's motives for the change were we may only infer. The part, however, which he seems to have played in the religious restoration under Augustus agrees more exactly with the figure of a Stoic than with that of an Epicurean²³. Donatus remarks (*Vita*, 35): anno aetatis quinquagesimo secundo inpositurus Aeneidi summam manum statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare, ut reliqua vita tantum philosophiae vacaret. What philosophy? A return to the villula Sironis, Professor Frank would probably say. But may we not more probably conjecture that it was to a further study of Stoicism, perhaps in the endeavor to work out more completely the problems of fate and eschatology which are, after all, so roughly sketched in the Aeneid?

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

REVIEW

Solon the Athenian. By Ivan M. Linforth. University of California Publications in Classical Philology 6. 1-318. November, 1919.

This book, says the author (iii), "falls into two distinct parts, a biography of Solon and an edition of the fragments of his poems". He should perhaps have said three parts, if the dictum attributed to Professor Kittredge is accepted, "Anyone can write a book; it takes a scholar to write an article", since Professor Linforth's well printed volume contains also nine Appendices. And, seeing that the edition is copiously annotated and accompanied by an opposite page translation into English, it puts into the hands of the Anglo-Saxon reader, whether he knows Greek or not, an easy means to form his own impression of the work and the ideas of the thoughtful poet whom Lord Acton calls "the most profound political genius of antiquity". That is a substantial service.

Professor Linforth arranges the fragments according to the epoch of the ancient authors through whose quotation of them they have reached us, including in each instance the accompanying comment, where any exists. This has the obvious drawback of disassociating parts of the same poem, while there is not much that is positive to commend it. It has the negative advantage, however, of enabling the editor to print the fragments on some principle, and with their non-Solonian context, without having to combine them

²²For Horace's later rapprochement with Stoicism see Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, 389.

²³Compare Boissier, *Le Religion Romaine*, 1.221 ff. (1900). He gives a detailed and excellent treatment of the theology of Vergil. In the present article, I have, from limits of space, confined myself chiefly to the points directly raised by Professor Frank. On page 230, note 1, Boissier has some pertinent remarks directed against those who have tried to find in the Aeneid the traces of Epicureanism.

¹⁸Aeneis, Buch VI², 348.

¹⁹The Classical Review 14 (1900), 153 f.

²⁰Just as the entrance took place at dawn (255), and midday was reached at verses 535 f.

²¹Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, 391, remarks that this last line sums up the whole ethics of Stoicism.